

Summary of Task Force Comments

DAHLIN GROUP TEAM - Page 1 of 2

	Strengths	Weaknesses
<u>1. Vision, Outcomes and Understanding Specific Plan:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed some aspects of Vision/Outcomes • Good local project experience • Knows Council Vision; 20 yrs. experience in Valley • Recognized complexity of ownership • Liked urban approach (not campus industrial) • Higher density, mixed use and good new urbanism • Covered land use issues well/good global experience • Can rely on "built work" • Understands local market/not afraid to push envelope • Emphasis on hydrology important • Knows the objectives/Vision & how to achieve them • Devcon knows office and R & D • Had the best understanding of the density needs and how to best deal with them • Strong alignment with Objectives & Vision • Thorough, well researched/thoughtful presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much! • Tried to cover too much too fast! • Needs more focus on community needs such as schools, churches etc.
<u>Other Comments:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good tools • Not sure of what work they have done at this scale? • High rise potential intriguing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vancouver exciting but may not work here • Understood need for public outreach • Standard approach/not out of box thinking
<u>2. Overall Project Approach:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large competent team/good in public outreach • Good economic based approach • Loved the Gondola! • Not afraid to push the envelope • Best at answering questions/willing to listen • Strong on environmental factors/hydrology as a definition of urban form • Good env. approach/knows water is an important issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall project approach seemed routine • Not sure what work is comparable? • Not much experience in mixed use • Confusing regarding protection of open space • Usually associated with low density residential development • Nervous and rushed in presentation • Concerned about 20-story towers/would it detract from Downtown? • Too busy, not focused
<u>Other Comments:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rivermark & South Livermore: fairly good examples • Best thoughts on relationship of density & open space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ran out of time in the end of presentation

Summary of Task Force Comments

DAHLIN GROUP TEAM - Page 2 of 2

	Strengths	Weaknesses
<u>3. Quality of Presentation:</u>		
<u>a. Organization:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized/interesting concepts • Great range of skills • Impressive multi-media approach • Good slides/Java on small screen • Nice flow of information • Very good/structured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poorly organized/almost chaotic • Hard to assess/poor quality presentation • More boards than we needed to see • Background of boards and videos running detracted from the presentation • Unclear how they'll share the work? • Not a detailed vision, but had limited time • Too much material/unfocused • Presentation seemed disjointed • Too many small graphics/small print
<u>Other comments:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not really strong on the existing plan process 	
<u>b. Substantive Content:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of retention lakes was good • Good on some details • Good understanding of broad issues (jobs/housing) • Very good/strong team • Transportation interaction was good example • Very innovative, bold and ambitious 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substance weak • Type on panels & Power Point too small • No previous similar projects • Too much material • Emphasis/focus on presentation unclear
<u>c. Graphic Content:</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overwhelming, but "more is better" given short time • Excellent presentation of building alternatives with high rise options • Good graphics/interactive tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too busy, too many photos and slides
<hr/>		
4. General Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High rise interesting idea • Green Building principles good • Good in some parts, but others missing • Destination Retail/New Urban Dist. good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimate on number of schools is correct • Written statement better than their presentation • Team seemed weak/Not good on comparable work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discussion of the loss of view corridors in the Valley • Public presentation will be very very important and this firm seems very weak in presentation skills